

Interview Summary

Application N .

09/633,093

Applicant(s)

GREENBERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Q. Janice Li

Art Unit

1632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Q. Janice Li, PTO.

(3) Patrick Kelly, Appl. Rep.

(2) Anne Marie Wehbe, PTO.

(4) Jonathen Dermott, Appl. Rep.

Date of Interview: 27 August 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Anderson, Boswell, Greenberger, Lobb references.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants requested interview before the first action on RCE. The arguments presented when filing RCE were discussed. The Examiner agreed that Lobb reference as it stands now may fall, a new search and consideration will be performed. Applicants representatives argue that Anderson reference only mentioned cryopreservation, without teaching details, and the combining Anderson, Boswell, and Greenberger is improper hindsight. The Examiners indicated the previous claims donot recite details of cryopreservation, nor a method that is distinct from the prior art. The newly presented claim details the outline of the method, would be searched accordingly .